

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 were pending as of the action mailed on June 23, 2009. Claims 1, 5, 9, 14, 20, 24, and 25 are in independent form. Claim 26 is newly added. Support for claim 26 can be found in the specification at least at page 11, lines 8-15; FIG. 6.

Reconsideration of the action is respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-11, 13-17, 19-21, and 22-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,046,995 ("Rygaard"). The Examiner rejected claims 12, 18, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rygaard in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,233,601 ("Walsh").

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Section 102 Rejections

Claim 1

Claim 1 is directed to a computer implemented jumping application security console that includes instructions to replace code from the jumping application that implements a first behavior with a piece of code from the database into the jumping application that implements the first behavior when the jumping application is received at the security console during a jump between hosts, and where the code is replaced for each jump of the jumping application between hosts.

The Examiner states that Rygaard describes replacing code for each jump of the jumping application between hosts at col. 8, lines 13-34. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The portion of Rygaard relied upon by the examiner describes a "mobile application security system 50 for detecting unwanted changes to the code of a mobile application" (col. 8, lines 14-15). In particular, the cited portion describes that "for code or data of a mobile application that is marked as immutable, the server may assume that the code or data has been altered (without necessarily performing the comparison) and always replace the code or data with code or data that is known to be safe" (col. 8, lines 30-34).

However, the cited portion of Rygaard do not teach or suggest replacing code from the jumping application that implements a first behavior with a piece of code from a database into the jumping application that implements the first behavior when the jumping application is received at the security console during a jump between hosts, and where the code is replaced for each jump of the jumping application between hosts. In particular the cited portion does not teach or suggest replacing code that implements a particular behavior. The cited portion also fails to teach or suggest replacing code of a jumping application with code from a database to implement the behavior. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 5

Claim 5 is directed to a jumping application security console that includes replacing code from the jumping application that implements a first behavior with a piece of code from the database into the jumping application that implements the first behavior where the code is replaced during each jump between hosts.

As set forth above with respect to claim 1, the cited portion of the reference does not teach or suggest replacing code that implements a particular behavior. The cited portion also fails to teach or suggest replacing jumping application code with code from a database to implement the behavior. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 5, as well as claims 6-8, which depend from claim 5, are in condition for allowance.

Claim 9

Claim 9 is directed to a method that includes receiving the jumping application at the security console from a host; identifying a piece of code in the jumping application that implements a particular behavior; and removing the identified piece of code in the jumping application that implements the particular behavior each time the jumping application jumps between hosts. For at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 1, claim 9, as well as claims 10-13, which depend from claim 9, are in condition for allowance.

Claim 14

Claim 14 is directed to a jumping application security system that includes instructions

that replace code from the jumping application that implements a first behavior with a piece of code from the database when the jumping application is received at the security console during a jump between hosts, and where the code is replaced into the jumping application that implements the first behavior each time the jumping application jumps between hosts. For at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 1, claim 14, as well as claims 15-19, which depend from claim 14, are in condition for allowance.

Claim 20

Claim 20 is directed to a server for a jumping application security system that includes instructions that replace code from a jumping application received from a host through a network with a piece of code from a database into the jumping application each time the jumping application jumps from the first host to a second host. For at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 1, claim 20, as well as claims 21-23, which depend from claim 20, are in condition for allowance.

Claim 24

Claim 24 is directed to a computer-implemented method that includes, when the first host is an untrusted host, determining whether the received jumping application includes code that implements a particular behavior and when the jumping application includes the code, replacing the code in the jumping application that implements a particular behavior with a piece of code that implements the particular behavior in the jumping application so that the jumping application has the particular behavior when it is executed by the second host.

As set forth above, the cited portions of the reference fails to teach or suggest replacing code that implements a particular behavior. Therefore, claim 24 is allowable for the same reasons as claim 1.

Additionally, claim 24 recites determining whether a first host is an untrusted host and when the host is untrusted determining whether code implementing a particular behavior is included in the jumping application. The relied upon portions of Rygaard do not teach or suggest determining whether the jumping application includes code implementing a particular

behavior and replacing the code when the host is untrusted. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 24 is allowable for at least this additional reason.

Claim 25

Claim 25 is directed to a jumping application security system that includes a security module having instructions to replace code from a jumping application with a piece of code from a database into the jumping application each time the jumping application jumps between hosts. As set forth above, the cited portion of the reference does not teach or suggest replacing code that implements a particular behavior. The cited portion also fails to teach or suggest replacing jumping application code with code from a database to implement the behavior. Therefore Applicant respectfully submits that claim 25 is allowable.

New Claim

Claim 26 is newly added. Claim 26 is directed to a computer implemented jumping application security console where the piece of code corresponds to a program for implementing the particular behavior. Applicant respectfully asserts that the relied upon portions of the references do not teach or suggest that the piece of code replaced in the jumping application is a program for implementing a particular behavior.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that all the claims are in condition for allowance.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the Examiner, Applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, Applicant's selecting some particular arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist. Finally, Applicant's decision to amend or cancel any claim should not be understood as implying that the applicant agrees with any positions taken by the Examiner with respect to that claim or other claims.

Applicant : Christopher A. Rygaard
Serial No. : 10/686,886
Filed : October 15, 2003
Page : 13 of 13

Attorney Docket No.: 18511-0011001

The additional claim fee is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other credits or charges to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 23, 2009

/Brian J. Gustafson/

Brian J. Gustafson

Reg. No. 52,978

Customer No. 26181
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071

50664220.doc